

May 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10811

All other considerations disregarded (e.g., the usual demographic correlates of nonvoting), there seems to be some preliminary evidence to hypothesize a small lethargy effect of some sort. Along the same line, a Berkeley sample of 344 voters, queried at the polls after voting showed a small tendency for Johnson voters to have become less interested in voting because of hearing the newscasts that Johnson had already won. Goldwater voters in this substudy became more interested in voting after hearing the broadcast predictions.⁵

⁵D. Fuchs, "Election Day Newscasts and Their Effects in Western Voter Turnout," *Journalism Quarterly*, winter 1965, pp. 22-28.

SENATORIAL-GUBERNATORIAL PREFERENCES

While no doubt a less important determinant of turnout than presidential preference and its attendant cognitive structure, one's leanings in the secondary race on a presidential election-year ballot are important enough to mention here. Even if the presidential race were a sure thing (and those very sure of a Johnson victory in our total sample outnumbered the Goldwater predictors by 6 to 1), voting turnout would still be relatively high. For example, in the nonpresidential race in 1962, 78.8 percent of all registered Californians turned out to choose a Governor and a U.S. Senator. This

compares with a figure of 88.4 percent in the 1964 presidential election.⁶

These are the senatorial-gubernatorial choices as expressed before the November 3 election.

⁶Both figures are no doubt attenuated by relying completely on inaccurate base figures of valid registrations. California is said to have in operation now an intercounty registration data exchange; i.e., a person moving from Los Angeles to San Francisco would have his old registration removed from the rolls when he registered in San Francisco. An out-of-State move, however, leaves the old name on the books. In this case, a registered voter who moved out of State might finally be marked a nonvoter in the county records.

TABLE 3.—*Stated voting for Senator/Governor and preelection preferences of voters and nonvoters*

	Alameda				Orange				Seattle			
	Voters		Nonvoters		Voters		Nonvoters		Voters		Nonvoters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Preferred the Democrat.....	342	41	12	48	202	26	3	14	238	32	20	32
Preferred the Republican.....	306	37	8	32	415	53	9	43	344	46	25	40
Undecided, refused.....	173	21	4	16	103	13	3	14	124	17	13	21
Voted Democratic.....	365	45	12	48	208	30	3	23	255	34	15	24
Voted Republican.....	348	42	6	24	429	62	5	38	399	53	26	40
Refused to state.....	81	10	1	4	45	7	0	0	64	9	10	16

The minimal data from Orange County show nonvoters having initially aligned themselves toward Murphy by a 3-to-1 proportion; this compares to a 2-to-1 margin among those who finally did cast a vote. The opposite result was obtained in Alameda. Salinger was more highly favored among the persons who stayed away from the polls than among the people who went to vote. In a recently released statement, Mr. Salinger asserted that 350,000 persons refrained from voting because of the early release of Johnson victory predictions on election day. At this point of our analysis, we will venture so far as to say that if nonvoters in Alameda County had indeed voted, they would have voted for Salinger in greater numbers than for MURPHY. The reverse would probably have occurred in Orange County. The magnitude of the split-ticket vote, however (approximately 10 percent), makes any analysis that would directly attribute senatorial voting to a function of presidential preference or voting somewhat questionable.⁷ That is, perhaps 10 percent of the persons who did not turn out might have been expected to vote for Johnson and MURPHY.

TURNOUT AND THE OTHER ISSUES

Let us look at another part of this election study, for a different slant on what brings out the vote. Some 4 weeks before the election, 1,200 Californians, in a statewide probability sample, were asked this question by the Field Research Corp. of San Francisco:

⁷The California "statement of vote," election Nov. 3, 1964, puts the total statewide vote for Johnson at 4,171,877 or 57.7 percent; for Goldwater, 2,879,108, or 39.8 percent; for Salinger, 3,411,912, or 47.2 percent; and for MURPHY, 3,628,555, or 50.2 percent. Thus in California there was a split-ticket vote of approximately 10 percent in favor of MURPHY.

"Suppose you had not yet voted on election day when you heard that according to the predictions of a computer based on votes already cast, Lyndon Johnson was considered sure of winning no matter how the vote went here in California. Do you think you would go out and vote, or would you probably not bother to go to the polls?"

The 1,180 persons who said they would still vote were then asked: "What would be your main reason for going out to vote?" Then another question, this time based on the supposition of a projected victory for Goldwater was asked everyone. It, too, was followed, for the 1,180 "yes" respondents (10 of the 20 "noes" were also "not bothers" from the previous question) by a question of the reasons for voting. Table 4 shows one important thing in the line of the present discussion.

TABLE 4.—*Reasons for still voting in spite of hearing a "declaration of victory"*

	Projected Johnson victory		Projected Goldwater victory	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Want to vote on other issues.....	195	16.2	193	16.2
Want to vote for my man whether he wins or loses.....	427	35.4	454	38.2
Do not believe the predictions, they could be wrong.....	247	20.5	236	19.9
Other reasons.....	337	27.9	304	25.6

NOTE.—The questions were asked in open-ended form.

In both cases, only 16.2 percent of the respondents said that they wanted to vote on other issues. Now, it is obvious that the remainder would not refrain from voting in the absence of a presidential election. The

fact remains, however, that in California we can expect at least 10 percent of the eligible citizens in the State to refrain from voting in off year elections, no matter how hotly contested those elections may be.

BROADCAST NEWS LISTENING AND VIEWING

If we have given short shrift to the consideration of the host of variables which make up a comprehensive index of likelihood to vote, it is mostly because of lack of space. We do have data on a number more of the characteristics and reported attitudinal states which traditionally relate to turnout. They will be treated in depth in a later, longer publication. For now, the primary concern is in establishing whether exposure to radio-television news broadcasts on November 3 affected turnout. We acknowledge that other factors may or may not have had their effects.

In order to affect voting, the broadcasts must have been listened to or at least heard about. We concentrated on the former for the reason that most of the respondents listened at some time that Tuesday afternoon or evening (96 percent in Orange, 92 percent in Alameda, and 95 percent in Seattle.)

About 10 percent of the respondents in the California areas and a bit less than that in the Seattle sample were exposed to the election broadcasts before casting their own votes. This, incidentally, is a conservative figure in each case. Both questions were phrased in terms of within-hour intervals; if a person was tuned in first at 5:15 p.m., but did not vote until 5:45 p.m., he is in an overlapping interval and is not counted in the above figures. Notwithstanding the number we may have missed because of the overlapping of the response categories on these two questions, the conclusion is clear: At most, only about 10 percent of our sample could have been affected by the election day newscast—either in turnout or vote switching.

10812

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 21, 1965

TABLE 5.—Election-day viewing or listening behavior of voters and nonvoters

	Alameda				Orange				Seattle			
	Voters		Nonvoters		Voters		Nonvoters		Voters		Nonvoters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Time of exposure:												
1 to 5 p.m.	269	33	4	16	282	41	4	31	307	41	18	29
5 to 6 p.m.	390	48	7	28	389	56	6	46	460	61	28	44
6 to 8 p.m.	647	79	18	72	638	78	8	62	628	84	47	75

NOTE.—Numbers are not additive through time intervals. There is increasing redundancy in each of the last 2 intervals.

For all respondents, listening increased as the day wore on. Closer analysis shows that there was no apparent dropoff in listening among Goldwater voters, a finding which might surprise the dissonance theorists, at least on its face value.* Table 5 indicates, most importantly, that listening was consistently lower among nonvoters: another piece of evidence in the explanation that would have us attributing most of nonvoting to a just-plain-don't-care attitude about this election—and probably about politics in general.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The question of whether our sample populations' voting turnout in the past general election was much affected by the early broadcasts of the Johnson victory has been answered. The effect was minor. Both our California sample areas showed turnout rates of about 87 percent among the interviewed respondents. Seattle showed a turnout of about 92 percent in our sample, and the Farmer's Almanac may have been as good a predictor of that relatively lower turnout as the most sophisticated computer program. On November 3 in Seattle, it rained hard all day. Perhaps there was an interaction effect between rainfall and the broadcasts of Johnson's victory. But even that makes the part played by the electronic media rather insignificant—from the quantitative viewpoint at least.

We are aware, too, that our high turnout figures are not completely representative of the registered populations sampled. The verified voting rates among those persons who refused to be interviewed or reinterviewed,

viewed, for example, were lower than among our before-after sample members. There is no reason to doubt that the broadcast effects were different in these two other types of populations. Maybe as likelihood of voting decreases generally (as it did in the latter subgroups) the real effect of the computer predictions assumes a greater relative proportion.

But whatever conditional phrases we use, the fact remains that the overall magnitude of the effect was small. This does not, however, answer two related questions which must be considered: (1) Was the broadcast effect on turnout insignificant socially as well as statistically? (2) Was the effect, as measured, in any way predictive of possible effects in future elections? (If Governor Scranton had been nominated, would the not-so-early declarations of a Johnson victory have effected more late hour changes in turnout?)

Many examples of extremely close lower level elections could be cited on the first point. The Nevada senatorial race in 1964 is a good example. The final count showed Senator CANNON reelected by a margin of about 100 votes. This is a margin of less than 0.0001, or one-tenth of 1 percent of the total Nevada vote. It does not take much of an effect, either from the early victory declarations or anything else, to change a margin like this one. If 1 more Democrat in every 1,000 refrained from voting because the President had already won, Senator CANNON would be ex-Senator CANNON today. The importance of this small effect, of course, increases as the number of total votes cast in any election decreases. That is, we posit that even such a tiny effect as that we have described may have changed more than a few town council posts and the like throughout the West this past November.

The second question is not as easy to answer as the first. Surely this was a strange election. Much has already been written on its uniqueness. There is bound to be a return to normalcy next time. So what effect

might the prediction broadcasts have had in a Scranton-Johnson contest? First, a closer election would even under the present laws, make for less time in which a broadcast effect could make itself felt. As the vote count in the East is closer, so the predictions become more difficult, and so the necessary electoral margin is not perhaps reached until the Mountain States have reported. There is this autoregulatory feature to be considered.

But even with less time for west coast voters to be affected, there is a possibility that certain dimensions of the effect would be greater under more normal circumstances than those of 1964. For example, given less intense commitment to a Scranton than to a Goldwater, is it not possible that there would be more of a late day defeatist feeling among Republicans, which might in turn elicit nonvoting? Or is it not possible that Johnson voters would be less intense too (i.e., less likely to vote) if the alternate to their candidate was someone not quite so threatening as a Goldwater?

It is clear that there are still a number of questions yet to be answered. Among these is the assessment of the part that the broadcast predictions played in the late day switching of allegiance on secondary elections and on other ballot issues. As has been mentioned, a third phase of interrogation is currently being undertaken to look more closely at this area.

SHOULD THERE BE PREVENTIVE LEGISLATION?

Even if the measurable broadcast effects on voting turnout were minor, there was still a concern among our respondents about these broadcasts. The last question in the post-election interview read: "Some people have suggested that a law be passed to prevent the announcing of election results until people all over the country have finished voting. Would you favor or oppose such law?" (and, "why?") Table 6 shows the breakdown of the responses by candidate preference.

TABLE 6.—Candidate preference and the law to prevent early broadcasts of election returns

	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Favor.....	214	44.2	140	59.8	84	32.3	165	52.6	211	49.2	196	72.9	53	23.4	73	48.7
Oppose.....	197	40.7	86	23.2	120	45.1	110	29.6	125	29.1	56	13.4	119	52.6	42	28.0
No opinion.....	73	15.1	28	12.0	66	21.5	66	17.8	93	21.7	37	13.7	64	23.9	35	23.3
Total.....	484		234		260		371		429		269		226		150	

Johnson voters in the four areas exhibited differential and, at present, unexplainable feelings about the question. Goldwater voters, however, are strongly and consistently in favor of the proposed legal prevention of early returns broadcasting. The strength of the margin of favoring versus opposing the prevention law is, perhaps, even attenuated somewhat by the overriding feeling of opposition to any governmental control that we might expect among Republicans. Now, what does this result mean for the present

research? We have made a tentative speculation that the Goldwater voters' responses reflected a concern that their candidate, and perhaps all local Republicans too, were losing votes because of the early returns. Possibly the concern has dimensions of both a fear of a "handwagon effect" and also a defeatist effect. It is not unreasonable to impute some personal projection to the responses of the Goldwater voters. Maybe they felt affected themselves. This is being investigated in the third phase of the study now underway.

ORDER OF LAFAYETTE ENDORSES FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Order of Lafayette has just concluded its annual meeting, to which Senator LAUSCHE contributed with his customary sage counsel. One object of this prominent organization of patriotic citizens is to endeavor to unite the destinies of our Nation and France in defense of a free

May 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10813

world, realizing that any weakening of the traditional friendship of these countries will aid the cause of world communism, and will jeopardize the survival of free nations.

A resolution was adopted at this meeting, which should be given wide publicity, since it is based upon the laudable desire to counter the training of thousands of prospective subversives from foreign lands by the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent to include the following resolution calling for enactment of the Freedom Academy bills in the RECORD.

The Order of Lafayette recognizes our need to improve defenses of the non-Communist world against this new kind of aggression taught professional revolutionaries by Communist powers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is now clearly recognized that, despite economic and military superiority during the past 20 years, close cooperation with the United Nations and the most immense foreign aid program in world history, the United States has deteriorated as a world power, due to massive failures in the nonmilitary area of political and propaganda warfare; and

Whereas it is now becoming increasingly clear that Communist officials are highly trained and dedicated Marxists, whose consistent goal is domination of the free world by a master strategic plan and by effective political warfare; and that this has resulted in the successful training of 20,000 student subversives each year who return to their countries as effective Communist leaders to promote infiltration and subversion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette in convention assembled, May 8, 1965, That the United States immediately initiate countermeasures to confront Communist aggression, infiltration and political takeover, by establishing a number of Freedom Academies to enable the citizens of the free world to develop the political skills necessary to preserve their freedom; and further be it

Resolved, That the Order of Lafayette recommends that the House of Representatives and the Senate take affirmative action on the Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission bills as a most important initial measure in a new strategic plan for confronting Communist aggression in the cold war.

THE 700TH ANNIVERSARY OF DANTE ALIGHIERI

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, through the efforts of our American citizens of Italian descent we all have the opportunity to participate in observing the 700th anniversary of one of Italy's most illustrious sons, Dante Alighieri.

Born in Florence in 1265, Dante spent much of his life in that city until he was exiled. Here in Florence he dreamed and thought and wrote in such a far-reaching manner that he outdistanced and overshadowed most of his contemporaries. In fact the world has only recently caught up with some of his sane and profound views.

The 13th century into which Dante was born was one of exceptional unrest not too unlike this 20th century. Great social, religious, and scientific changes were being made; economic, political, and

philosophical concepts were in a state of turmoil; the minds of men were being tempered in the fires of yearning and ambition and were being molded by adversity. Few periods in history have developed such great thinkers and Dante was one of the foremost.

Although noted primarily for his great poetry, Dante was an outstanding scholar in science and philosophy, in government and in art. We can but wonder how any man could have acquired such a wealth of understanding when the difficulties of reading and having access to reading materials was so staggering.

We are indebted to this great poet, philosopher, and statesman for what his works have meant to us and our forefathers for the past 700 years in the formation of our social and political concepts. I hope that all of us study again the timeless works of that great man of destiny. To the extent to which the Italian-American societies stimulate us to study and contemplate Dante's works they will be making a lasting contribution to our well-being. To them all America should be grateful.

THE FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and informative article entitled "Colorado's New Future With the Fry-Ark."

The article was published in the May 1965 issue of Reclamation Era; the author is Eleanor M. Gale, a native Coloradoan, who has devoted much time and research to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. I think the article will be of particular interest to those who are interested in water and the West.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reclamation Era, May 1965]

COLORADO'S NEW FUTURE WITH THE FRY-ARK
(By Eleanor Gale)

(NOTE.—Mrs. Gale, born in and a resident of Pueblo, Colo., for 22 years, now lives in Denver with her husband, Dr. Scott A. Gale and three youngsters, ages 4, 3, and 2. An aspiring writer, she recently had her first major publication—a first-person experience in the November 1964 edition of Redbook magazine. Having majored in creative writing at Pomona College, Claremont, Calif., an opportunity for her to write about something in which she really believed occurred in her junior year, when she spent 6 months in Washington, D.C., studying the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. Her voluminous writings on the project are now in the Library of Congress. Mrs. Gale combines writing and homemaking with a part-time job doing institutional research at Colorado Woman's College in Denver.)

"Southern California Needs Colorado River Water." It was painted blue and glittering gold, and mounted over an archway at the Los Angeles County Fair, in a pavilion which housed a marvelous display of the abundance to be found in southern California.

I walked from building to building, through lush gardens planned by experts and nurtured all year for this one home and garden show, viewing many varieties and

mammoth examples of citrus and avocados, cars and homes of the future. And I was struck by a shocking comparison.

It was my first year in college away from home, and this was nothing like home. Our town had no palm trees, no orange groves; our State fair exhibits were mostly sheep and cattle, and dust. Our town was in southern Colorado. Southern Colorado, I decided, also needs Colorado River water.

I remembered the summer before, when we were allowed to irrigate our lawns every other day. Some people even rustled water after dark, for their thirsty lawns. Shower baths were limited in some places, and air coolers were outlawed. Cattle were dying and ranchers and farmers were moving out. And nobody was moving in.

Each day through the mail I received copies of my hometown paper, the Pueblo Star Journal and Chieftain, rolled up the size of a toothpick compared to that of the Los Angeles Times. In it I read of the needs and support for the project which would save the Arkansas Valley from its yearly classification as a disaster area. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project had for many years been the darling of countless organizations throughout southeastern Colorado and certain partisan legislators in Washington.

What was this project with the unusual name? It was a multiple-purpose project which would supply supplemental water for irrigation of crops—also municipal and industrial water, generation and transmission of hydroelectric power, control of floods, provision for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and creation of new recreational opportunities in Colorado. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project borrows its name from the Fryingpan River, a tributary of the Roaring Fork River, from which water will be diverted under the Continental Divide and into the Arkansas Valley in southeastern Colorado. It is a name which stuck, and it belonged to a project which stuck.

FOR OR AGAINST

For 30 years in Colorado, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project was something you were for if you lived on one side of the divide—and against if you lived on the other. For 10 years in Congress, Pennsylvania argued against it because it meant spending money on public power. California argued against it because many of its people felt it was a plan to rob them of something which by rights belonged to them. They felt that they owned the water involved. And among those in Colorado who did want it passed, many were homemakers who realized the poor quality and scarcity of the water available to them, or businessmen who knew that to survive economically, arid parts of Colorado had to have more water. But they really didn't know what was involved from a political standpoint, and certainly not from the engineering standpoint.

The western slope needed water. But I was from the eastern slope. That night at the fair in California, I decided to learn as much as I possibly could about the project, a subject which has held my interest for the past 9 years. I've read a bookshelf full of background, traveled to Washington and back, and even made myself learn to understand engineering principles and terms. I've learned reclamation jargon and the politics involved. Now "acre-feet" is a household word, and I can recite the project's legislative history backward.

But now the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, instead of remaining a legislative case history, has become a priceless part of Colorado's future. In 1962 it found its congressional approval—having been researched, changed, and planned by the Bureau of Reclamation people enough to satisfy western Colorado interests and unify Colorado in its favoring of the project. Several sets

of legislators had come and gone until the right combination occurred, and the bill was passed—all \$170 million worth of it.

What will those millions buy? A series of dams, tunnels, canals, reservoirs, powerplant—the ingredients of a new era in Colorado.

On July 19, 1964, ground was broken for the first stage of the project, the construction of the \$20-million Ruedi Dam and Reservoir, which is planned as a compensating impoundment, to store 100,000 acre-feet of water for western Colorado's benefit. This initial phase of the project, which will take about 1,300 days to complete, is the deciding factor which brought favor to the bill in Congress and consolidated Colorado's interest in the project. It is also one of the major reasons for the rise of the estimated cost of the project since 1957. This cost includes the dam, a reservoir with 12 miles of shoreline, relocation of many miles of county roads, and buying rights-of-way. Working continued during the winter to drill a tunnel so that a cofferdam can be erected this year to divert the Fryngpan River, to allow the erection of the permanent dam to begin this spring. Ruedi Dam is expected to be completed by February of 1968.

At this beginning, the Fryngpan-Arkansas project, called by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall "one of the greatest water-resource developments ever undertaken in the West," has already begun to employ workmen and in other ways benefit the economy of the State. It is expected that the project will require 5,000 man-years of labor alone.

IMPACT OF RECREATION

The U.S. Forest Service has estimated that the development of recreational facilities in the White River National Forest would cost approximately \$1.4 million. These facilities will include roads, trails, campgrounds, picnic sites, docks and boat landings, parking areas, tree and shrub planting and grass seeding, costs of which are nonreimbursable. The recreational impact area involves 182,700 acres, 8,800 of which are now private land. Property values have begun to rise impressively.

Of the project as a whole, money spent for irrigation, power, municipal water supply and delivery systems—over 90 percent of construction cost—will be paid back to the Government. And this, together with interest, will result in a total reimbursement of \$228 million to the U.S. Treasury.

The next phase of the Fryngpan-Arkansas project will be the development of the western slope water collection system—drawing from the south side collection area, and involving the construction of three major tunnels. One of these, the Divide Tunnel, is 5.3 miles long, and has a 10½-foot-diameter bore. It will carry water from the west to the east side of the Continental Divide, to Turquoise Lake (also called Sugar Loaf Reservoir) 5 miles southwest of Leadville, Colo. This town, famous for its mining history, has become the scene of exciting development with the beginning of the project.

About 70,000 acre-feet of water from Turquoise Lake (enlarged from 17,000 acre-feet capacity to 117,000 acre-feet capacity), will be carried annually through a series of canals to Twin Lakes Reservoir, which will be enlarged to five times its present size.

From Twin Lakes Reservoir, the water will be released through a series of powerplants into the Arkansas River near Salida. From this point, the water will flow in the river to be impounded in Pueblo Reservoir, which will be formed by the erection of Pueblo Dam across the river west of Pueblo. Pueblo Reservoir will store 400,000 acre-feet of water. This phase will involve relocation of about 20 miles of Denver & Rio Grande Railroad track, with a seventh powerplant to be located at Pueblo Dam. The new lake will have a 61-mile shoreline.

For most residents of Colorado it is impossible to realize the great changes the Fryngpan-Arkansas project will make in the economic structure of the State, and the types of businesses which will be attracted to the area. Many of the towns in Colorado, which are now simply places to "go through," will become attractive recreational areas. Pueblo, my hometown, will, upon completion of the reservoir, have a high tourist potential.

Colorado, until recently, was not achieving the amount of progress which by rights it should enjoy as one of the States richest in natural resources and scenic beauty. Today, it has a reputation of being a playground for the winter sportsman and a paradise for the summer camper. But this does not give enough attention to the situation of the year-round resident of Colorado—who gives and gets all which is his within the State alone.

COLORADO'S APPEAL

We've heard western slogans containing romantic words and emotional appeal, but we've known in the past that these could not apply to us because of our desperate lack of water. Given Colorado's space and beauty, given its strategic location as the real center of the United States, given its clear air and the ease of transportation within its boundaries, its relatively untapped labor resources and its enthusiastic, progressive businessmen—given all these valuable factors, Colorado's score would still be low without water. With water where needed, Colorado will emerge the important western State that it could be.

With more water for irrigation, Colorado land now involved in farming will yield more varied crops to feed the growing population of the State.

With more municipal, domestic, and industrial water available, new and long-term industries will join the already established and internally well-developed industries currently enjoying the advantage of the large amount of undeveloped land in the State. New cities will emerge, and well-rooted cities in Colorado will grow and improve in quality—reaffirming the faith of those who have already invested in housing developments, apartment complexes, new schools, and shopping centers. These were threatened with being surpluses the already burdened State could not afford to bear, before the certainty of adequate water.

The Bureau of Reclamation has done its part in honestly and accurately planning and designing the most feasible project to alleviate the Arkansas Valley's lack of water; the Congress has given its approval and appropriation of funds; now it's up to Colorado to plan wisely for the many benefits which will result from the project.

The real key to the State's future development is to be found in such planning. Colorado should be able to utilize the knowledge. There are examples of several areas within our United States which have grown without careful anticipation or coordination. But we have the years before the Fryngpan-Arkansas project will be complete; let us now plan ideal communities.

The Fryngpan-Arkansas project is a valuable investment in the future of Colorado.

THE BRIGHTON NATIONAL BANK CASE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article on the Brighton National Bank case. The article, written by Bob Whearley, was published on May 16 in the Denver Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BRIGHTON BANK CASE—QUIZ HINTS SHAKE-UP OF COMPTROLLER STAFF

(By Bob Whearley, Denver Post staff writer)

WASHINGTON.—Three moves appear likely in the wake of a Senate investigation of the Brighton National Bank scandal:

The resignation of James J. Saxon as U.S. comptroller of the currency, coupled with a shakeup in the comptroller's staff.

Introduction of legislation to tighten national bank chartering procedures and regulation of those banks.

Criminal indictment of three or more of the fast-buck artists involved in the tangle of counterfeit securities and forged notes that marked the Brighton scheme.

For 3 weeks, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN's permanent investigations subcommittee heard testimony detailing the rise and million-dollar fall of Brighton National.

Most of the testimony was taken behind closed doors, ostensibly to protect the image of "live" banks that at one time had been involved with the Brighton promoters.

But there was more to it than that, some witnesses complained bitterly in the hallway outside the hearing room. The secrecy, they said, also kept off the public record all but the briefest mention of a live politician, former Governor Steve McNichols.

McNichols is president of 17th Street National Bank, which 2 years ago loaned \$448,000 in the Brighton National's organizers—a loan reportedly made over the objections of McNichols, who at that time was vice president of the bank.

He also is Democratic national committeeman for Colorado, and a friend of Saxon.

Because of these things, McNichols has been the target of a whispering campaign, of oblique accusations of guilt-by-association and of influence peddling.

But if McNichols is embarrassed, Saxon has reason to be mortified.

Throughout last week's public hearings, Senators repeatedly rapped the Comptroller's office for allowing Brighton National to remain in operation long after it learned something was fishy.

In questioning Saxon's deputy, Justin Watson, Chairman MCCLELLAN observed bluntly:

"... It appears first that you did not make any adequate examination or inquire into the character of these folks who were organizing this bank, and into the other factors that ought to have been weighed and considered, maybe, at the time the charter was granted.

"Number two, after the bank got in bad condition, after you knew that it was under suspicious management and after you had information of such transactions as have been brought to light here, you permitted the bank to go on and continue to operate until January 22, 1965, is that right?"

Mr. WATSON. "That is correct."

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, another member of the subcommittee, seconded MCCLELLAN's observations.

"I am especially disturbed by the delayed reaction almost amounting to inaction itself on the part of the responsible Washington officials after evidence concerning forgeries and counterfeit securities became known to them," MUNDT said.

"... There should be more diligence and more energy and a tremendous amount of more promptness in dealing with situations of that kind.

"I think it is rather unconscionable that so many months elapsed between the time that the evidence became available and that action was forthcoming."

RESIGNATION RUMORED

Saxon's resignation has been rumored for several months. He still has a year and a half to go on his 5-year appointment to the post, but there have been reports he will quit soon to take a position with a New York